



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. By WILLIAM FLAVELLE MONYPENNY and GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE. Volume III., 1846-1855. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. x, 591.)

THE third volume of the *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, covers only the years from 1846 to 1855. It begins with the break-up of the old Tory party after the adoption of free trade by Peel, and ends with the collapse of the Aberdeen coalition government in January, 1855. Brief as is the period covered it is doubtful whether in the whole range of English political biography from the American Revolution to the great war of 1914-1915, there is a more strikingly interesting or, what is more important, a more revealing volume. Except for the Earls of Derby and Malmesbury and Bentinck, Disraeli had no colleagues of prominence in the Conservative party in the years from 1846 to 1855 whose achievements in or out of Parliament warranted a detailed biography. It was the most disorganized, futile, and barren period in the history of Toryism from the death of Pitt to the break-up of the Liberal party over Gladstone's Home Rule bill of 1886. Bentinck died in 1848, and Disraeli was his biographer. There is a life of Malmesbury; but so far there has been no official life of Derby, no life that embodies any of Derby's correspondence; and nothing of either memoirs or history takes the edge off this third volume of the life of the remarkable man who was Derby's colleague in the leadership of the Conservative party in its years of disruption and weakness.

The first two volumes of the Disraeli biography, it will be recalled, were written by the late Mr. Monypenny, who died in November, 1912, within ten days after the publication of the second volume. Except for chapter II.—an analysis of Tancred—the third volume is entirely the work of Mr. Buckle; and Mr. Buckle has handled the eventful period of Disraeli's life from 1846 to 1855—and also this extremely intricate period in the history of the Whig, the Peelite, and the Liberal and Radical parties—with such complete success that his readers will fervently hope that the war will cause no delay in the publication of a fourth and concluding volume.

A Whig administration succeeded the government of Peel in July, 1846. Russell was Premier, and Palmerston Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Russell desired a coalition with the Peelites, who then numbered nearly a hundred members in the House of Commons. His overtures were, however, declined by Dalhousie, Lincoln, and Herbert. Peel was concerned only with keeping the protectionists out of office, and was anxious not to take the government again. As the Whigs, Radicals, and Irish who followed Russell, all told, did not constitute half the House, the strength of the new ministry lay in the support of the Peelites, and in the absence of well-organized or effective opposition either in Parliament or in the constituencies. Derby, then Lord Stanley, was the leader of the protectionists, with Lord George Bentinck as his

lieutenant in the House of Commons; and from July, 1846, until the end of the session, the protectionists retained their seats on the government side of the House.

In the Parliament of 1841-1847 Disraeli was one of the members for Shrewsbury. At the general election he transferred himself to Buckingham—the shire in which his father had his home, and in which, after his purchase of Hughenden Manor in 1847, Disraeli himself lived until his death in 1881. Disraeli was elected a knight of the shire without a contest. His address to the electors of Buckingham is memorable as a statement of his political views and convictions at a time when he was easily foremost in the uphill work of reorganizing the old Tory party. He deprecated any precipitous or factitious attempt to repeal the free-trade measures of 1846. “The legislative sanction which they have obtained”, he declared, “requires that they should receive an ample experiment”. He was in favor of placing the education of the people in the hands of the clergy, “their legitimate guides and instructors”; and he was emphatic in his adhesion to the alliance of Church and State. He held that Liberalism set class against class, exalted political economy at the expense of human nature and patriotism, and insisted that the Tories must be the popular party as opposed to doctrinaire Liberalism.

Disraeli by no means abandoned protection as early as 1847; for in a speech at Aylesbury he predicted that Parliament after a fair, full, and ample trial of free trade would be driven to abandon it from absolute necessity. It would take this step, Disraeli assured his electors, “at the termination of much national suffering”; “but that suffering”, he added, “will be compensated for by the bitterness and the profundity of national penitence”. Mr. Buckle is of the protectionist party in England. His sympathies are obviously with the cause which Derby, Malmesbury, Bentinck, and Disraeli, and what was then known as the country party, represented at the election of 1847; and his comment on Disraeli’s prophecy is that “the trial has been fuller and more ample than Disraeli anticipated, but it is evident that the end is not yet”. The protectionists met with no response to their appeal to the electors in 1847. The Whigs and their supporters and the Peelites were in a majority in the new House of Commons; and the first session of the new Parliament saw Derby again leading the protectionists in the Lords, Bentinck leading the party in the Commons, and Disraeli, who had abandoned the motley garments of his early years, on the front opposition bench with Bentinck.

Bentinck retired at the end of the first session of the new Parliament. He broke with the country and Protestant party over his speech and vote in favor of the government bill for the removal of Jewish disabilities. Never since the Tory party came into existence, never since party lines were clearly drawn in Parliament and Whigs and Tories occupied benches on opposite sides of the House of Commons, was the Tory party more bereft of men of ability in the Lords and in the Commons

than in the years from 1846 to the incoming of the Palmerston administration in 1855. Derby and Disraeli were the only men who could command an audience either in or out of Parliament. That Disraeli should succeed Bentinck as leader in the Commons was as obvious as the great chair in which the Speaker is enthroned. But Disraeli was still regarded by many Conservatives as an adventurer; he was deeply in debt; Derby distrusted him and kept him at a distance; and the queen was not yet disposed to overlook his conduct towards Peel in the closing months of Peel's last tenure of office. The result was that when Bentinck resigned, the leadership of the country party in the House of Commons was put in the charge of a committee of three—Disraeli, the Marquis of Granby, and Herries, who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Goderich administration of 1827–1828. The plan was an impossible one. The committee soon abandoned its weekly meetings. For all practical purposes the plan had collapsed before the end of 1848; and on February 22, 1849, Disraeli wrote triumphantly to his sister, "after much struggling I am fairly the leader". Complete and cordial recognition from the Conservative party was delayed for some months; but in March, 1849, Disraeli was regarded by Russell and his colleagues of the treasury bench as leader of the opposition, and on the 16th of that month Russell in his nightly Parliamentary letter to the queen informed her Majesty that Disraeli showed himself a much abler and less passionate leader than Bentinck.

Disraeli had at last arrived. But when Bentinck had tried the strength of the country party in the House of Commons in the first session of the new Parliament, he could muster only 120 followers. There had been no accessions to it between 1847 and 1849; and when Disraeli assumed the lead Derby and the Conservatives were still committed to protection. The country was prosperous and would give no heed to the cry for a return to protection. The party had no other policy. It had scarcely a corporal's guard of men of either Parliamentary or platform ability, and it was poorly served in the press. It is at this point—after Disraeli became leader of the Conservatives in the Commons—that Mr. Buckle's volume becomes so valuable. The letters of Derby, Disraeli, Malmesbury, Londonderry, and also of the Conservative whips, are copiously drawn upon; and from these can be learned more about Derby's ability and shortcomings as a leader than from any other volume of political memoirs, as well as of the great difficulties that confronted Disraeli between 1849 and the downfall of the coalition ministry in 1855. These grew out of his past and of his relentless hostility to Peel in the Parliament of 1841–1847. Other more serious difficulties developed out of the poverty of the Conservative party in men of Parliamentary ability; out of the stubbornness with which Derby clung to protection, and his unwillingness either to retire from the leadership of the party or to make a serious effort to give it an effective lead. Still another difficulty was the lack of any constructive policy. The party

was floundering from 1846 to 1855; and much of the interest of this third volume is in the new light that it throws on the history of the Whig and Peelite parties as well as on the internal organization and drifting of the Conservatives in the decade that followed the downfall of Peel.

Mr. Buckle makes no attempt to conceal his own political convictions. They crop out, as has been noted, when he is concerned with protection, and again in writing of democracy and taxation. In view of the heavy contributions to taxation which the working classes of the United Kingdom have made through the revenue duties on beer, tobacco, and tea, and especially in view of the willingness of the Labor party in the war session of 1914 to extend the income tax to wage-earners, there is not much ground for Mr. Buckle's lament that the tendency of democracy "to exempt almost entirely from taxation the classes who hold political power fills political philosophers with disquiet for the future". But no possible objection can be made to a biographer infusing a little of himself into his work, and nothing but praise can be accorded Mr. Buckle's first volume of the Disraeli biography; for he has given us a book that can be read from beginning to end with the keenest interest by people who have never had volumes I. and II. in their hands and who may have no expectation of reading volume IV.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Report of the International Commission to inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Intercourse and Education, Publication No. 4.] (Washington, D. C.: Published by the Endowment. 1914. Pp. 413.)

WHEN in the course of the second Balkan War the newspapers reported that a commission was to be sent by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to investigate the Balkan atrocities on the spot, many readers wearily shrugged their shoulders over the announcement. *Cui bono?* The misdeeds had been done, the dishonored dead would not return to life, and as long as the moral and racial conditions of the peninsula remained what they were, the outrages were sure to be repeated in the future regardless of the most convincing statistics and the most moving homilies. Over a year has passed and now the *Report* of the commission is submitted to the public. The most indifferent sceptic who reads it with open mind will be forced to grant that here is a body of material collected with single-minded attention to the truth and that, though done is done and all our tears will not blot out a single wrong, it was yet worth while to bring together all this material while it was fresh and throbbing which goes to prove how ruthless man may become in pursuit of an idea. For it was the idea of national greatness that caused this orgy of Balkan crime. The members of the commission were eight in number, who came from six great neutral coun-